arXiv:1609.00370v2 [quant-ph] 23 Sep 2016

Quantum phase estimation with squeezed quasi-Bell states

Douglas Delgado de Souza and A. Vidiella-Barranco [1]

Instituto de Física "Gleb Wataghin" - Universidade Estadual de Campinas
13083-859 Campinas SP Brazil

Abstract

In this paper we analyze the quantum phase estimation problem using continuous-variable, entangled squeezed coherent states (quasi-Bell states). We calculate the quantum Fisher information having the quasi-Bell states as probe states and find that both squeezing and entanglement might bring advantages, increasing the precision of the phase estimation compared to protocols which employ other continuous variable states, e.g., coherent or non-entangled states. We also study the influence of a linear (unitary) perturbation during the phase estimation process, and conclude that entanglement is a useful resource in this case as well.

1 Introduction

The precision of measurements may in principle be improved using quantum mechanical effects, viz., the quantum aided metrology [1]. A convenient way of quantifying the precision in parameter estimation, for instance, is via the quantum Fisher information (QFI) [2, 3]. Also, non-classical states of light have become a promising resource for the improvement of parameter estimation [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. Amongst the quantum states of light (probe states) which might bring advantages to phase estimation and that have been already discussed in the literature, we may cite the continuous-variable states, either one-mode (squeezed) states [11, 12] or two-mode (entangled coherent) states [13, 14, 15, 16]. Interestingly, schemes employing continuous-variable states in the low photon number regime have a superior performance when compared to schemes using other types of non-classical states, for instance, the "NOON" states [15]. It has also been demonstrated the optimality of squeezed states in ideal phase estimation, as well as the fact that the QFI scales quadratically with the mean photon number if squeezed states are employed in place of coherent states (linear scaling) [11]. It is therefore of importance to seek other probe states that could lead to more efficient protocols. We remark that in the above mentioned works, features such as squeezing and entanglement have been considered separately in different protocols. Thus, we may ask ourselves: could we have any advantage if we use continuous-variable entangled states also exhibiting squeezing?

In this work we investigate the adequacy, for phase estimation purposes, of interpolated quasi-Bell squeezed states, which are continuous-variable entangled states having squeezed coherent states $|\alpha,\xi\rangle$ as component states. It should be noted that, under more realistic conditions, if one considers external unwanted influences such as noise [5] or even a "unitary disturbance" [12, 17], the accuracy of the estimation may be considerably degraded. Accordingly, we will analyze the phase estimation using quasi-Bell squeezed states also taking into account a linear unitary disturbance in the derivation of the QFI. Our manuscript is organized as follows: in Section 2 we present the calculations of the QFI and study the quantum phase estimation using quasi-Bell squeezed states. We first consider the ideal case and also investigate the effect of a linear disturbance. The role of entanglement in the phase estimation is also discussed in that Section. In Section 3 present our conclusions.

2 Quantum phase estimation with quasi-Bell squeezed states

A class of interesting continuous variable states are the quasi-Bell squeezed states, defined as [18, 19]

$$|\Psi_l\rangle = \mathcal{N}\left(|\alpha,\xi\rangle_A\,|-\alpha,\xi\rangle_B + l\,|-\alpha,\xi\rangle_A\,|\alpha,\xi\rangle_B\right) \tag{1}$$

$$|\Phi_l\rangle = \mathcal{N}\left(|\alpha,\xi\rangle_A\,|\alpha,\xi\rangle_B + l\,|-\alpha,\xi\rangle_A\,|-\alpha,\xi\rangle_B\right) .$$

Where $\xi = re^{i\theta}$ is the squeezing parameter, with $\alpha, r \geq 0$ and $\theta \in [0, 4\pi)$. The overlap between the different component states is given by $\kappa = \langle\alpha,\xi|-\alpha,\xi\rangle = \exp\left\{-2\alpha^2\left[\cosh(2r) + \sinh(2r)\cos\theta\right]\right\}$. We

[1] vidiella@ifi.unicamp.br

have also introduced the auxiliary interpolating parameter l ($-1 \leq l \leq 1$), and $\mathcal{N}$ is the normalization factor $\mathcal{N} = 1/\sqrt{1 + l\,(l + 2\kappa^2)}$. For our purposes we are going to consider only the input states $|\Psi_l\rangle$.

We would like to remark that the interpolation parameter l is intimately related to the entanglement of the state $|\Psi_l\rangle$[2] and this will allow us to identify the role of entanglement in the phase estimation process without compromising the other parameters involved. We have that, for $l = -1$ the state $|\Psi_l\rangle$ is a maximally entangled state, while for $l = 1$ the state is partially entangled in general, becoming maximally entangled only in the limit of $\kappa \to 0$. For $l = 0$ we have a product state, and mode A of $|\Psi_l\rangle$ is reduced to the squeezed coherent state $|\alpha, \xi\rangle$.

2.1 Phase estimation without disturbance

We consider the following phase rotation transformation

$$U_\phi = e^{-i\phi G_A}, \qquad G_A = a_A^\dagger a_A \tag{2}$$

applied to mode A of the entangled state $|\Psi_l\rangle$:



Given that the involved state is pure and the transformation is unitary, the QFI is given by:

$$H\left(\phi\right) = 4\left[\langle\Psi_l|G_A^2|\Psi_l\rangle - \left(\langle\Psi_l|G_A|\Psi_l\rangle\right)^2\right]. \tag{3}$$

Expanding the expression in Eq. (3) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} H\left(\phi\right) &= 4\left[\mathcal{N}^2\left({}_A\langle\alpha,\xi|G_A^2|\alpha,\xi\rangle_A + l^2\,{}_A\langle-\alpha,\xi|G_A^2|-\alpha,\xi\rangle_A + \right.\right. \\ &\quad \left.\left. + l\kappa\,{}_A\langle-\alpha,\xi|G_A^2|\alpha,\xi\rangle_A + l\kappa\,{}_A\langle\alpha,\xi|G_A^2|-\alpha,\xi\rangle_A\right) - \left(n_{\mathsf{in},A}\right)^2\right], \end{aligned}$$

where the mean photon number in mode A of state $|\Psi_l\rangle$ is

$$n_{\mathsf{in},A} = \mathcal{N}^2\left[\left(1 + l^2\right)n_0 + l\kappa\gamma\right], \tag{4}$$

with $n_0 = \alpha^2 + \sinh^2 r$ being the "average photon number in the component state $|\alpha, \xi\rangle$" and $\gamma = 2\kappa\left\{\sinh^2(r) - 2\alpha^2\left[\sinh(4r)\cos\theta + \cosh(4r)\right]\right\}$.

The most challenging terms to compute are of the kind $\langle-\alpha,\xi|U|\alpha,\xi\rangle$ (the A subscripts have been omitted) and can be obtained through

$$\langle-\alpha,\xi|U|\alpha,\xi\rangle = \langle 0|U'\,D\left(2\alpha\cosh r + 2\alpha e^{i\theta}\sinh r\right)|0\rangle, \tag{5}$$

where U' is the operator U after the transformation $a \to \left(a\cosh r - e^{i\theta}a^\dagger\sinh r - \alpha\right)$. In this way, the QFI can be computed straightforwardly term by term. After some manipulations we obtain:

$$H\left(\phi\right) = 4\left\{N^2\left[\left(1 + l^2\right)\gamma_1 + l\kappa\gamma_2\right] - \left(n_{\mathsf{in},A}\right)^2\right\},$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &\equiv {}_A\langle\alpha,\xi|G_A^2|\alpha,\xi\rangle_A = {}_A\langle-\alpha,\xi|G_A^2|-\alpha,\xi\rangle_A \\ &= \alpha^4 - \alpha^2\left[1 + \sinh(2r)\cos\theta\right] + \frac{1}{2}\left(4\alpha^2 - 1\right)\cosh(2r) + \frac{3}{8}\cosh(4r) + \frac{1}{8}, \end{aligned}$$

[2] A discussion about the properties and generation of the quasi-Bell squeezed states will be presented elsewhere.

and

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_2 &\equiv 2\mathrm{Re}\left[{}_A\langle -\alpha,\xi|G_A^2|\alpha,\xi\rangle_A\right]\\ &= \frac{1}{4}\kappa\left\{2\alpha^2\left[\alpha^2\left(1+2\sinh^2(4r)\cos(2\theta)+3\cosh(8r)\right)-2(\sinh(2r)+3\sinh(6r))\cos\theta\ +\right.\right.\\ &\quad -6\cosh(6r)]+4\cosh(2r)\left[4\alpha^2\left(2\alpha^2\cosh(4r)+1\right)\sinh(2r)\cos\theta-\alpha^2-1\right]+\\ &\quad \left.+\left(8\alpha^2+3\right)\cosh(4r)+1\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Naturally, if we let $l=0$ we re-obtain the following equation derived by Monras [11]

$$H(\phi)_{l=0} = 4\alpha^2\left[\cosh(2r)-\sinh(2r)\cos\theta\right]+\cosh(4r)-1\,. \tag{6}$$

We now re-parametrize the QFI as a function of n_0 and the "squeezing fraction of the component state $|\alpha,\xi\rangle$", $\beta=\sinh^2 r/n_0$. In this approach, we should not interpret the parameters n_0 and β as having any specific physical meaning; they are just two auxiliary parameters that will be useful to compare the results of this work with the non-entangled case [12].

The energy of the input state depends on the parameters n_0 and β of the component state $|\alpha,\xi\rangle$ as well as on the interpolating parameter l. For this reason, we represent the QFI as a function of the input average photon number $n_{\mathsf{in},A}$ [Eq. (4)] in mode A of the entangled state $|\Psi_l\rangle$ and as a function of the parameter β. It is not an easy task to algebraically invert Eq. (4) to obtain n_0 explicitly as function of $n_{\mathsf{in},A}$, and we do this numerically, adjusting the value of n_0 in order to get the desired input photon number $n_{\mathsf{in},A}$. In Fig. 1 (*top*) we plot the QFI as a function of the squeezing fraction β. The optimal probe state is the one capable of reconciling the gains due to entanglement without loosing the gains due to squeezing. We notice that when $l>0$ we have a "squeezing fraction" $\beta<1$ for which the QFI is greater than the one obtained with non-entangled states. However, when $l<0$, although we have a state that may be maximally entangled when $l\to-1$, we notice that we do not have any increase for the QFI. Thus we conclude that the best strategy is to spend all the energy in squeezing the state. To understand this phenomenon, we analyse the parameter n_0 that the component state $|\alpha,\xi\rangle$ must have in order to let the input photon number be the available value $n_{\mathsf{in},A}$ (Fig. 1(*bottom*)). Because the energy $n_{\mathsf{in},A}$ increases for $l\to-1$, we must reduce n_0 to keep the energy $n_{\mathsf{in},A}$ fixed while we change l. This implies a reduction of the QFI when $l\to-1$, unless we make $\beta=1$ and the optimal state is not entangled.

2.2 Phase estimation with linear unitary disturbance

We now consider the estimation of phase under a linear unitary disturbance $Q_A = a_A + a_A^\dagger$. The corresponding evolution operator is [12, 17]

$$U_{\phi,\eta} = \exp\{-i(\phi G_A+\eta Q_A)\}, \tag{7}$$

with $G_A = a_A^\dagger a_A$. Again, we will be using the partially entangled states $|\Psi_l\rangle$. As we are dealing with pure states, we may follow the procedure developed in section 2.1 in order to compute the QFI, or

$$H(\phi) = 4\left[\langle\Psi_l|\bar{G}_A^2|\Psi_l\rangle-\left(\langle\Psi_l|\bar{G}_A|\Psi_l\rangle\right)^2\right].$$

Here the average generator of the evolution of mode A is given by

$$\bar{G}_A = G_A+\frac{\eta}{\phi^2}\left(\phi Q_A+2\eta\right)\left(1-\frac{\sin\phi}{\phi}\right)+\frac{\eta}{\phi^2}P_A\left(\cos\phi-1\right),$$

with $P_A=-i\left(a_A-a_A^\dagger\right)$. Now using Eq. (5) and doing some algebraic manipulations for the other terms, we obtain an analytical expression for the QFI. Due to its large size, though, we opted to omit that expression in this work.



Figure 1: QFI for the phase estimation using entangled probes. (*top-left*) Negative l parameter, from bottom to top we have $l = \{-1.0, -0.8, -0.6, -0.4, -0.2, 0.0\}$. (*top-right*) Positive l parameter, from top to bottom $l = \{1.0, 0.8, 0.6, 0.4, 0.2, 0.0\}$. Black line in both plots: non-entangled case ($l = 0$) corresponding to the situation treated in a previous work [12]. (*bottom-left*) Parameter n_0 of the component state $|\alpha, \xi\rangle$ for $l < 0$ and (*bottom-right*) $l > 0$. In all cases $n_{\mathsf{in},A} = 1$ and the squeezing angle θ is the optimal one.

2.2.1 Optimal state for the estimation of a very small phase ϕ

After computing the limit $\phi \to 0$, we want to find the quasi-Bell state which allows the maximum precision for the phase estimation. In order to do so, we keep the input energy $n_{\mathsf{in},A}$ fixed. We consider different values for the interpolation parameter l and then we maximize the QFI as being a function of the parameters β and θ. In Fig. 2 we plot the optimal "squeezing fraction" β_{opt}, the optimal squeezing angle θ_{opt}, as well as the maximized QFI H, as a function of the parameter l. Each curve corresponds to a fixed input average photon number $n_{\mathsf{in},A}$.

We have verified that if the parameter l is negative, the optimal input state is not an entangled state, and the mode A of this state corresponds to what has been previously found [12], i.e., the QFI is given by

$$H = 8\left(n_0 + n_0^2\right) + \left(2n_0 + 2\sqrt{(n_0 + n_0^2)} + 1\right). \tag{8}$$

We remind that in the case of phase estimation with single-mode states we have $\beta_{\mathsf{opt}} = 1$. If l increases from 0 to 1, though, the QFI increases if there is enough energy. In this range of values for the energy, increasing β past ≈ 0.8 leads to a reduction of entanglement. This is because the components of the quasi-Bell state become two squeezed vacuum states, and the overlap $\kappa = \langle \alpha, \xi | -\alpha, \xi \rangle$ increases [18]. For this reason, β_{opt} is not equal to 1, which reconciles the gains due to entanglement with the gains due to squeezing for the phase estimation. In Fig. 3 we plot the entanglement of the optimal probe state for various interpolation parameters l. We draw attention to the fact that even when we take $l \neq 0$, entanglement is not imposed, because the state is not entangled if $\beta_{\mathsf{opt}} = 1$, as it happens for $l < 0$. Moreover, in the case of a single mode squeezed state (when there was no additional parameter l) $\beta_{\mathsf{opt}} = 1$ was indeed the optimal value for the "squeezing fraction". This means that the phase estimation with linear unitary disturbance could be upgraded by the use of entangled states.

The QFI is gradually increased when we allow the state to be more and more entangled (increasing l), so it seems natural to look for a more direct relation between the entanglement of the quasi-Bell states and the resulting QFI. When we found the optimal parameters β and θ for the input state by maximizing the QFI, we removed the dependence of the QFI on those parameters. We are now able to observe



Figure 2: (*top-left*) Optimal parameters "squeezing fraction" and (*top-right*) "squeezing angle" of the component state as function of l. (*bottom*) quantum Fisher information H as function of the interpolation parameter l for the optimal input states. We have $n_{\mathsf{in}} = \{0.2, 0.6, 1.0, 1.4, 1.8\}$ from bottom to top in the H plot (**and the colors identify the curves in the β_{opt} and θ plots**, except for $n_{\mathsf{in}} = 0.2$ that is overlaped with the l axis in the θ plot and is the straight line $\beta_{opt} = 1$ in the β_{opt} plot. For all the plots we have $\eta = 1$.

the dependence of the QFI on the interpolation parameter l, which fixes the maximal entanglement of the input state. Because both the QFI and the entanglement are monotonic functions of l, for $l > 0$, we can represent the QFI directly as a function of the entanglement for this (positive) l semi-axis. In Fig. 4 we notice that the QFI increases monotonically as the entanglement of the probe state increases, showing that entanglement is a resource for quantum phase estimation even if there is a unitary disturbance in the system.

2.2.2 The effect of disturbance on the phase estimation with entangled states

The QFI is an increasing function of the parameter η of the disturbance because there is an energy increase parameterized by η during the transformation. The average photon number in the mode A of the output state may be calculated in the following way:

$$n_{\mathsf{out},A} = \langle n_A \rangle_{\phi,\eta} = \langle \Psi_l | \, U^{\dagger}_{\phi,\eta} \, n_A \, U_{\phi,\eta} \, | \Psi_l \rangle \ . \tag{9}$$

Using again Eq. (5) we obtain, in the limit of $\phi \to 0$:

$$n_{\mathsf{out},A} = \mathcal{N}^2 \left[\left(\alpha^2 + \sinh^2 r + \eta^2 \right) \left(1 + l^2 \right) + l \kappa \gamma_3 \right] \ ,$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_3 &\equiv 2\mathrm{Re} \left[{}_A \langle -\alpha, \xi | \, U^{\dagger}_{\phi,\eta} \, n_A \, U_{\phi,\eta} \, | \alpha, \xi \rangle_A \right] \\ &= 2\kappa \left\{ \eta^2 + \sinh^2 r - 2\alpha^2 \left[\sinh(4r) \cos\theta + \cosh(4r) \right] \right\} \ . \end{aligned}$$

We notice that, as expected, for $l \to 0$ and $\phi \to 0$, $n_{\mathsf{out},A}$ reduces to

$$n_{\mathsf{out}} = \alpha^2 + \sinh^2 r + \frac{4\eta(\alpha\phi + \eta}{\phi^2} \sin^2\left(\frac{\phi}{2}\right) . \tag{10}$$



Figure 3: Entanglement of the optimal probe state as function of the interpolation parameter l. As in the previous plots, $n_{\text{in}} = \{0.2, 0.6, 1.0, 1.4, 1.8\}$ from bottom to top. The first plot, $n_{\text{in}} = 0.2$, is overlaped with the l axis.



Figure 4: Quantum Fisher Information H obtained from probe states with entanglement E for l varying from 0 to 1 (left to right). All the other parameters have the optimal values in order to maximize the QFI for each value of l, mantaining the input photon number n_{in} fixed. The entanglement for $l = 1$ is different for each state and do not reach 1, that is why the plots end at different values of E. We have $n_{\text{in}} = \{0.6, 1.0, 1.4, 1.8\}$ from bottom to top, and $\eta = 1$ for all the plots. What would be the first curve, $n_{\text{in}} = 0.2$, appears as a point overlapped with the H axis because for all values of l we have $E = 0$ and H is constant.

In order to perform a more precise analysis of how the QFI depends on the disturbance, we plot in Fig. 5 the QFI as a function of the average photon number in mode A for $l = 1$ (similarly to what is done in [15, 16]). Of course for $l = 0$ we re-obtain the previous results for single-mode Gaussian states [12].

We note that the presence of the disturbance η affects the phase estimation also when the probe state is entangled, if the total available energy (input state + transformation) is taken into account. However, we observe that the QFI may attain larger values than in the non-entangled case [12], showing once more the advantages of using entangled states for quantum phase estimation even in the presence of a unitary disturbance.

Finally, we may analyze the feasibility of the adjustment of the parameters that were optimized along this work. Firstly we remark that the plot in Fig. 5 corresponds to the behavior of the left ends ($l = 1$) of the plots in Fig. 2 (*bottom*), when we consider higher energies. For $l = 1$, the value of β_{opt} is well defined, but it may be hard to reach it for a total input photon number larger than $n_{\text{in}} \sim 4$. This is because, in this case, we have $0,98 \lesssim \beta_{\text{opt}} < 1$ and the sensitivity of the QFI upon a very small variation of β around β_{opt} is very high. The plot in Fig. 5 represents then only a theoretical indication of how entanglement may be useful for phase estimation.



Figure 5: QFI H as a function of the average photon number $n_{\mathsf{out},A}$ on the mode A of the output state of the transformation for $l = 1$. The cases $l < 0$ correspond to the results in [12]. From bottom to top: $\eta = \{0.5, 1.0, 1.5\}$.

3 Conclusions

In this work we have analyzed the use of the interpolated quasi-Bell states as input probes for quantum phase estimation. We have compared the QFI in the ideal case with the QFI when a unitary disturbance is included in the Hamiltonian which determines the evolution. We have found that the use of continuous variable entangled states based on coherent squeezed states makes possible to increase the precision for phase estimation, specially when the total average photon number is not negligible ($n_{\mathsf{in}} \gtrsim 1$). We have verified that the QFI is an increasing function of the interpolation parameter l (for $l > 0$), which is related to the entanglement contained in the optimal probe state. We have also observed that the larger the unitary disturbance parameter η, the larger will be the energy of the output state, which increases the QFI. However when we consider all the energy spent in the process (including the energy used in the transformation) we found that the disturbance actually impairs the phase estimation. We also highlight that for input states with higher energy, the "optimal squeezing fraction" parameter β_{opt} must be finely adjusted in order to maximize the QFI when $l = 1$.

Acknowledgements

D.D.S. acknowledges Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP) grant No 2011/00220-5, Brazil. A.V.B. acknowledges partial support from Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), INCT of Quantum Information, grant No 2008/57856-6, Brazil.

References

[1] Giovannetti, V., Lloyd, S., Maccone, L.: Advances in quantum metrology. Nat. Photonics 5, 222 (2011).

[2] Helstrom, C.W.: Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory. Mathematics in Science and Engineering : a series of monographs and textbooks. Academic Press, Ney York, (1976).

[3] Paris, M.G.A.: Quantum estimation for quantum technology. Int. J. Quantum Inf. 07, 125 (2009).

[4] Holland, M.J., Burnett, K.: Interferometric detection of optical phase shifts at the Heisenberg limit. Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 1355 (1993).

[5] Huelga, S.F., Macchiavello, C., Pellizzari, T., Ekert, A.K., Plenio, M.B., Cirac, J.I.: Improvement of frequency standards with quantum entanglement. Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 3865 (1997).

[6] Giovannetti, V., Lloyd, S., Maccone, L.: Quantum-enhanced measurements: beating the standard quantum limit. Science 306, 1330 (2004).

[7] Giovannetti, V., Lloyd, S., Maccone, L.: Quantum metrology. Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 010401 (2006).

[8] Nagata, T., Okamoto, R., O'Brien, J.L., Sasaki, K., Takeuchi, S.: Beating the standard quantum limit with four-entangled photons. Science 316, 726 (2007).

[9] Yonezawa, H., Nakane, D. Wheatley, T.A., Iwasawa, K., Takeda, S., Arao, H., Ohki, K., Tsumura, K, Berry, D.W., Ralph, T.C., Wiseman, H.M, Huntington, E.H., and Furusawa, A.: Quantum-enhanced optical-phase tracking. Science 337, 1514 (2012).

[10] Wasak, T., Smerzi, A., Pezzé, L., and Chwedeńczuk, J., Optimal measurements in phase estimation: simple examples. Quantum Inf. Process. 15, 2231 (2016).

[11] Monras, A.: Optimal phase measurements with pure Gaussian states. Phys. Rev. A 73, 033821 (2006).

[12] Souza, D.D., Genoni, M.G., Kim, M.S.: Continuous-variable phase estimation with unitary and random linear disturbance. Phys. Rev. A 90, 042119 (2014).

[13] Gerry, C.C.: Heisenberg-limited interferometry with four-wave mixers operating in a nonlinear regime, Phys. Rev. A 61, 043811 (2000).

[14] Gerry, C.C., Benmoussa, A., Campos, R.A.: Nonlinear interferometer as a resource for maximally entangled photonic states: application to interferometry, Phys. Rev. A 66, 013804 (2002).

[15] Joo, J., Munro, W.J., Spiller, T.P.: Quantum Metrology with Entangled Coherent States. Phys. Rev. Lett. 107, 083601 (2011); Erratum: ibid.: Phys. Rev. Lett. 107, 219902 (2011).

[16] Joo, J., Park, K., Jeong, H., Munro, W.J., Nemoto, K., Spiller, T.P.: Quantum metrology for nonlinear phase shifts with entangled coherent states. Phys. Rev. A 86, 043828 (2012).

[17] De Pasquale, A., Rossini, D., Facchi, P., Giovannetti, V.: Quantum parameter estimation affected by unitary disturbance. Phys. Rev. A 88, 052117 (2013).

[18] Hirota, O., Sasaki, M.: Entangled state based on nonorthogonal state. arXiv:quant-ph/0101018, 2001.

[19] Hirota, O., van Enk, S. J., Nakamura, K., Sohma, M., Kato, K.: Entangled nonorthogonal states and their decoherence properties. arXiv:quant-ph/0101096, 2001.